

Stephen M. Wontrobski
27132 Sombras
Mission Viejo, CA 92692

October 6, 2016

Mrs. Tammi McConnell, Program Manager
Orange County Emergency Medical Services
405 W. Fifth Street, Suite 301A
Santa Ana, CA 92705

Ref: OCFA Member City 2018 Withdrawal

Dear Ms. McConnell:

You may be aware that individual city members of the OCFA are contemplating leaving the OCFA in 2018. There are very good reasons for considering such a move.

Various member cities are currently financially strapped. Instead of addressing these member city financial needs for monetary relief, the OCFA recently signed a new firefighter union contract that grants even higher wages and benefits and imposes new work rules that add to an even higher cost structure at the OCFA.

The OCFA EMS union wages, benefits and work rules are way out of line when compared to wages, benefits and work rules in EMS private industry. My attached September 29, 2016 "OCFA 2015 Wage Compensation" letter provides evidence to support this fact.

In addition, widespread concern has arisen among both OCFA structural fund and contract city members regarding their ultimate city liability for the OCFA firefighters UAAL pension cost with OCERS. Previously, the member cities were advised by the OCFA that they had legally nothing to worry about regarding this matter. However, serious concerns regarding this initial legal advice have now arisen, and the OCFA is currently seeking outside expert legal counsel to advise it on this matter.

One of the options for a city withdrawal from the OCFA in 2018 is for a city to obtain EMS services from a private company ambulance provider with no impact to public safety. The city could obtain such private ambulance company services at a fraction of the cost it is now paying the OCFA. In order to do so, the cities contemplating such a move must first comply with Orange County EMS Policy No. 700, Section III-B-1 by submitting:

"A commitment of support from a responsible local government agency, i.e., city, County, or fire district."

Can you please advise me what an individual city must detail to you in its commitment of support letter and provide samples of any past commitment of support letters from Orange County or any neighboring county.

I thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Stephen M. Wontrobski

E:emccocfamemberecitywithdrawal10-6-16

Cc: Orange County Board of Supervisors; OCERS Board of Directors; OCFA Board of Directors

Stephen M. Wontrobski
27132 Sombras
Mission Viejo, CA 92692

September 29, 2016

Board of Directors
Orange County Fire Authority
1 Fire Authority Road
Irvine, CA 92602

Reference: OCFA 2015 Wage Compensation

Dear Board Members,

In the September 1, 2016 OCFA Board of Directors meeting, I objected to the signing of new OCFA contracts with the:

- a) Orange County Professional Firefighters Association; and
- b) Memorandum of Understanding - Chief Officers Association

I recommended non-approval of the two contracts, since there were no major reforms in wages, benefits, pensions or work rules included in the contracts. Simply put, in my opinion the firefighters were currently being paid too much and would be compensated even more under the proposed new contracts. I based this opinion on information regarding total 2015 compensation for the following OCFA work groups derived from the OCFA web site.

- 1. Firefighter
- 2. Fire Apparatus Engineer
- 3. Fire Captains
- 4. Fire Battalion Chiefs - Staff
- 5. Regular Fire Battalion Chiefs
- 6. Fire Division Chiefs

Firefighter

The average firefighter made over \$235,000 in total wage compensation for 2015, and they will be paid even more under the new labor contract.

Fire Apparatus Engineer

There were 225 workers in this category.

- a) All but two of the 225 workers in this group made over \$200,000.
- b) 134 of the 225 workers in this group made over \$250,000.
- c) Seven individuals in the Fire Apparatus Engineer Group made over \$300,000, and thus were included in the \$300,000 Club at the OCFA.

Fire Captains

There were 228 individuals in the Fire Captains Group.

- a) Of the 228 workers in this group, only 17 individuals made less than \$250,000.
- b) 98 individuals made between \$250,000 and \$300,000.
- c) 111 individuals made between \$300,001 and \$399,999 and thus were included in the \$300,000 Club.
- d) 2 individuals made over \$400,000, and thus became members of the \$400,000 Club.

Fire Battalion Chiefs - Staff

There were nine individuals in this wage category.

- a) Only one individual made less than \$300,000 in total yearly compensation
- b) 8 of the 9 group members made over \$300,000 in total yearly compensation.

- i) Two individuals made between \$300,000 and \$350,000;
- ii) Five individuals made between \$350,001 and \$400,000; and
- iii) One individual made over \$400,000, and thus became a member of the \$400,000 Club.

Regular Fire Battalion Chiefs

There were 23 individuals in this wage category.

- a) 20 of the 23 individuals in this wage category made over \$300,000.
- b) Of those individuals making over \$300,000, one individual in this group of 20 made over \$400,000 in total yearly compensation, and thus became a member of the \$400,000 Club.

Fire Division Chiefs

There were 10 individuals in this wage category.

- a) Every member of this group made over \$330,000.
- b) The individual member's total compensation ranged from approximately \$331,000 to \$403,000.

Past Informal Wage Studies

It is interesting to note that individual Board members and myself have conducted past informal surveys with potential applicants for starting OCFA firefighter positions. The informal surveys showed that an applicant's dream starting salary at the OCFA would be approximately \$75,000 with full health insurance benefits. This is dramatically below what OCFA starting members are currently being paid.

With OCFA salary packages so high, it is easy to understand why various members of the public have the following questions:

1. Why are starting firefighter wages so high, when top of the line recruits would jump at the opportunity to work at their "dream job" for far less in total wage compensation than what is currently paid at the OCFA?
2. Why are the OCFA workers being over compensated so much, when equally trained and experienced workers in private industry EMS and fire suppression groups are being paid fairly and objectively so much less?
3. Don't the overly generous OCFA compensation packages bring to mind the past large compensation packages of the City of Bell?
4. Shouldn't the OCFA labor negotiator and OCFA Executive staff receive failing grades of "F" for the failing results they obtained in the negotiation of the new firefighter contract?
5. Why weren't union work rules changed to provide cost relief to OCFA financially strapped member city costs? (Instead the contract work rules were made more burdensome and costly in the new labor contract.)
6. Why hasn't the Board set up an ad hoc committee to provide recommendations for all individual member cities to vote on implementing to reduce fire and EMS services in their cities without any negative impact to public safety?

Summary

It is interesting to note that I give the OCFA Board of Directors a grade of "D-" for the results they obtained in the negotiation of the new firefighter contract. Their grade would also have been an "F" were it not for the one Board of Directors vote against the contract by Director Rick Barnett from Villa Park. In my opinion the residents of Villa Park are privileged to have a director place the interests of his city residents primary in this issue, rather than other directors who voted to approve the contract to benefit their own future political and financial gain.

As in the past, I am submitting this updated wage report as a draft. I encourage the OCFA staff to review my findings and get back to me with any errors they might discover in the draft report. If I do not hear anything from the OCFA within ten business days, I will consider the report to be accurate and final.

Sincerely,

Stephen M. Wontrobski

E:ocfawagecompensation9-29-16

cc: Orange County Board of Supervisors



REGULATORY/ MEDICAL HEALTH SERVICES

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

MARK A. REFOWITZ
DIRECTOR

RICHARD SANCHEZ
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

STEVE THRONSON
DEPUTY AGENCY DIRECTOR
REGULATORY/MEDICAL SERVICES

DENISE FENNESSY
CHIEF OF OPERATIONS
REGULATORY/MEDICAL SERVICES

TAMMI McCONNELL MSN, RN
EMS ADMINISTRATOR

405 W FIFTH STREET, SUITE 301A
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA 92701
TELEPHONE 714- 834-3500
FAX: 714- 834-3125

November 1, 2016

To: EMS Distribution

From: Samuel J. Stratton MD, MPH, Medical Director, Emergency Medical Services
Tammi McConnell, EMS Administrator, Emergency Medical Services

Subject: Orange County EMS Policy Updates

The following policies have been updated in the Orange County Emergency Medical Services Policy & Procedure Manual:

New Policies

The following policies have been assigned new policy numbers. Any applicable comments are noted in italics.

New Policy Name and Number	Comments
#340.00 Authorized Registered Nurse (ARN)	<i>Policy created to establish authorization criteria and standards for Authorized Registered Nurses</i>
#398.05 First Responder Law Enforcement Agencies Approved to Administer Narcan	<i>Policy created to identify Law Enforcement Agencies approved to administer naloxone (Narcan)</i>
#650.10 Stroke Registry Data Dictionary	<i>Policy created to identify data standards for data submission required for all OCEMS Designated Stroke-Neurology Receiving Centers</i>

ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES

The following policies have had administrative updates

Policy Updated	Comments
#310.30 Trauma Triage	<i>Policy updated the reference for pediatric age</i>
#325.00 Advanced Life Support (ALS) Minimum Inventory	<i>Policy updated to current standards for supplies and medications</i>
#325.05 Air Rescue Inventory	<i>Policy updated to current standards for supplies and medications</i>
#400.00 Mobile Intensive Care Nurse (MICN) Authorization	<i>Policy updated to add language to clarify requirements for MICN challenge candidates.</i>
#510.10 EMT Skills Competency Verification Process	<i>Policy updated to reflect responsibility of providers to maintain approved skills provider list</i>
#520.00 Paramedic Training Program Criteria	<i>Policy updated to clarify language regarding approval processes for Paramedic Training Programs</i>
#530.00 EMS Continuing Education (CE) Provider	<i>Policy updated to clarify language regarding approval process for EMS CE Providers and issuance of continuing education hours</i>
#535.00 Public Safety Personnel: First Aid and CPR Training Program Criteria	<i>Policy updated to reflect current state regulations</i>
#650.00 Stroke-Neurology Receiving Center Designation Criteria	<i>Policy updated to identify and reference the SNRC data dictionary</i>

Current OCEMS Policies and Procedures can be found on our webpage:

<http://healthdisasteroc.org/ems/policies/>



REGULATORY/ MEDICAL HEALTH SERVICES
EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

MARK A. REFOWITZ
DIRECTOR
RICHARD SANCHEZ
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR
STEVE THRONSON
DEPUTY AGENCY DIRECTOR
REGULATORY/MEDICAL SERVICES
DENISE FENNESSY
CHIEF OF OPERATIONS
REGULATORY/MEDICAL SERVICES
TAMMI McCONNELL MSN, RN
EMS ADMINISTRATOR
405 W FIFTH STREET, SUITE 301A
SANTA ANA, CALIFORNIA 92701
TELEPHONE: 714- 834-3500
FAX: 714- 834-3125

November 16, 2016

TO: ORANGE COUNTY EMS DISTRIBUTION LIST
FROM: SAM J. STRATTON, MD, MPH *SJS*
MEDICAL DIRECTOR, ORANGE COUNTY EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES
SUBJECT: **REVISION TO POLICY # 310.30 (TRAUMA TRIAGE)**

The following criteria for ground level fall in patients greater than or equal to 75 has been deleted in OCEMS Trauma Triage Policy # 310.30:

III. DEFINITION OF TRAUMA VICTIM (MEETS TRAUMA CRITERIA")

C. Mechanism of Injury

Ground level falls from standing or walking in patients \geq 75 years old with a change in mental status or evidence of head or facial trauma.

The following has been added as a "special condition" to consider for possible trauma triage for an injured person:

IV. SPECIAL CONDITIONS

Patients with significant injury and any of the following may benefit from specialized trauma services; contact Base Hospital for destination decision regarding those with injury and:

- **Age 75 years-old or greater**

The above changes will become effective as OCEMS system-wide policy on December 1, 2016.

OCEMS field and emergency receiving center providers are encouraged to add evaluation of assessment, transport, treatment, and outcome of elderly ground-level fall victims to their quality assessment and improvement programs with notification of OCEMS of any suggested process improvements that will improve health and medical services for this special group of our community.

SJS/sjs #2791

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES AUTHORITY

10901 GOLD CENTER DR., SUITE 400
RANCHO CORDOVA, CA 95670
(916) 322-4336 FAX (916) 322-1441

RECEIVED
NOV 17 2016



November 14, 2016

Ms. Tammi McConnell, EMS Administrator
Orange County EMS Agency
405 West Fifth Street, Suite 301A
Santa Ana, CA 92701

Dear Ms. McConnell:

This letter is in response to Orange County's 2016 EMS Plan Update submission to the EMS Authority, on October 12, 2016.

I. Introduction and Summary:

The EMS Authority has concluded its review of Orange County's 2016 EMS Plan Update and is approving the plan as submitted.

II. History and Background:

Orange County received its last full plan approval for its 2014 plan submission, and its last annual plan update for its 2015 plan submission.

Historically, we have received EMS Plan submissions from Orange County for the following years:

- 1995
- 1999
- 2006
- 2014
- 2015

Health and Safety Code (HSC) § 1797.254 states:

*"Local EMS agencies shall **annually** (emphasis added) submit an emergency medical services plan for the EMS area to the authority, according to EMS Systems, Standards, and Guidelines established by the authority".*

The EMS Authority is responsible for the review of EMS Plans and for making a determination on the approval or disapproval of the plan, based on compliance with statute and the standards and guidelines established by the EMS Authority consistent with HSC § 1797.105(b).

III. Analysis of EMS System Components:

Following are comments related to Orange County's 2016 EMS Plan Update. Areas that indicate the plan submitted is concordant and consistent with applicable guidelines or regulations, HSC § 1797.254, and the EMS system components identified in HSC § 1797.103, are indicated below:

Not
Approved Approved

A. ☒ ☐ System Organization and Management

1. System Assessment Forms

- Standard 1.24. The Minimum Standard is indicated as not met. Pursuant to HSC § 1797.204, Orange County has the authority to initiate written agreements with providers, as statute and regulations supersede local ordinance. The EMS Authority encourages the Orange County advanced life support (ALS) providers that meet the criteria of HSC § 1797.201, to sign written agreements by the next EMS Plan Update.
- Standard 1.27. The Minimum Standard is indicated as not met. In the next plan submission, please provide an update on the progress toward meeting the Minimum Standard.

B. ☒ ☐ Staffing/Training

C. ☒ ☐ Communications

D. ☒ ☐ Response/Transportation

1. System Assessment Forms

- Standards 4.02, 4.18, 4.19, and 4.21. The Minimum Standards are indicated as met; however, pursuant to

HSC § 1797.204, Orange County has the authority to initiate written agreements with providers, as statute and regulations supersede local ordinance. The EMS Authority encourages the Orange County ALS providers that meet the criteria of HSC § 1797.201, to sign written agreements by the next EMS Plan Update.

2. Ambulance Zones

- Based on the documentation provided by Orange County, please find enclosed the EMS Authority's determination of the exclusivity of Orange County's EMS Agency's ambulance zones.

- E. ☒ ☐ Facilities/Critical Care
- F. ☒ ☐ Data Collection/System Evaluation
- G. ☒ ☐ Public Information and Education
- H. ☒ ☐ Disaster Medical Response

IV. Conclusion:

Based on the information identified, Orange County's 2016 EMS Plan Update is approved.

Pursuant to HSC § 1797.105(b):


"After the applicable guidelines or regulations are established by the Authority, a local EMS agency may implement a local plan...unless the Authority determines that the plan does not effectively meet the needs of the persons served and is not consistent with the coordinating activities in the geographical area served, or that the plan is not concordant and consistent with applicable guidelines or regulations, or both the guidelines and regulations established by the Authority."

Ms. Tammi McConnell, EMS Administrator
November 14, 2016
Page 4 of 4

V. Next Steps:

Orange County's next annual EMS Plan Update will be due on or before November 30, 2017. If you have any questions regarding the plan review, please contact Ms. Lisa Galindo, EMS Plans Coordinator, at (916) 431-3688.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Howard Backer", written over a light blue horizontal line.

Howard Backer, MD, MPH, FACEP
Director

Enclosure